

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15, and 17-32 have been canceled. Claim 12, and amended claims 5 and 16 are in this application.

Claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gefvert (US 5,850,457) in view of Ruzicka (U.S. 6,118,876), Lee (U.S. 5,589,718), Siems et al. (U.S. 5,470,253), Glover (U.S. 3,824,524) and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) of Figs. 12-14.

Amended independent claim 5 recites in part the following:

"an electronic apparatus having a back panel with at least four audio signal output terminals for a plurality of channels, said back panel being located on a rear portion of the electronic apparatus;

. . .

each of said audio signal output terminals is arranged corresponding to positions of said plurality of speakers such that signal output terminals corresponding to left channels are arranged to the right of signal output terminals corresponding to right channels as viewed from the rear portion of the electronic apparatus . .

..

. . .

each of the plurality of connecting cable members is distinguished by one of said plurality of colors corresponding to a color distribution of said colored marks surrounding each of said audio signal output terminals, and

said distinction of each of said plurality of connecting cable members is implemented by a plurality of thermally contractile tubes each bearing a black and white color mark to discern said plurality of connecting cable members," (Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 5 is distinguishable from the applied combination of references for at least the reasons herein below described.

First, the Examiner appears to assert that Gefvert and, in particular, Fig. 8B thereof discloses "each of said audio signal output terminals is arranged corresponding to positions of said plurality of speakers . . ." as in claim 5. However, it is respectfully submitted that such portion of Gefvert does not appear to disclose the specific arrangement set forth in claim 5, that is, "each of said audio signal output terminals is arranged corresponding to positions of said plurality of speakers such that signal output terminals corresponding to left channels are arranged to the right of signal output terminals corresponding to right channels as viewed from the rear portion of the electronic apparatus." In fact, Fig. 8B of Gefvert appears to illustrate the opposite arrangement for the terminals of the left and right channels. Additionally, the Examiner also appears to acknowledge this fact by indicating that Gefvert discloses the above feature "when viewed from the front of the receiver." (See the last line of page 2 of the present Office Action.)

Second, and as best understood, the Examiner appears to rely on Siems and, in particular, lines 14-18 of column 3 thereof to disclose "said distinction of each of said plurality of connecting cable members is implemented by a plurality of thermally contractile tubes . . .," as recited in claim 5. It is respectfully submitted that such portion of Siems does not appear to disclose "said distinction of each of said plurality of connecting cable members is implemented by a plurality of thermally contractile tubes each bearing a black and white color mark to discern said plurality of connecting cable members," as recited in claim 5. Although the portion of Siems relied on by

the Examiner appears to indicate that the connectors 34 and 36 may have different colors, such portion of Siems does not appear to disclose "thermally contractile tubes each bearing a black and white color mark" as in claim 5.

Accordingly, it is believed that claim 5 is distinguishable from the applied combination of references. For similar or somewhat similar reasons, it is also believed that claim 16 is distinguishable from the applied combination of references.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee ('718), Siems, Glover, and AAPA, and further in view of and Lee (US 5,984,717).


Claim 12 is dependent from independent claim 5. Accordingly, claim 12 is distinguishable from the applied combination of Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee ('718), Siems, Glover, and AAPA for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on Lee '717 to overcome the deficiencies of the applied combination of Gefvert, Ruzicka, Lee ('718), Siems, Glover, and AAPA. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 12 is distinguishable from the applied combination of references.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections and/or rejections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: April 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicants

749205\_1.DOC